

REMARKS

Claims 1 continues to be in the case.

New claims 2 to are being introduced.

New claim 2 is based on the language of the Abstract of the disclosure.

New claim 3 is based on the language of claim 1.

New claim 4 is based on the language of claim 3.

New claim 5 is based on Figure 3.

New claim 6 is based on Figures 3 and 4.

New claim 7 is based on Figure 3 and 4.

The disclosure stands objected to because of the following informalities: On page 5, line 5, the term "means" should not be used in the Abstract. Appropriate correction is required.

A revised Abstract of the Disclosure is attached.

Claim 1 stands objected to because of the following informalities: On page 4, line 3, it is not clear what is meant by "of those constituted as". Appropriate correction is required.

The present amendment corrects page 3, line 4 of the specification.

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the German reference (691) in view of Terada (665).

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action continues:

The German reference teaches a key shaft end with projections 7 and a semi-circular area between the projections which is received within a slot of a head 2, a central area of the head has a perforation which receives a stop 3 to retain the key shaft and head together.

The interpretation of the German reference appears to be incorrect.

Column 2, lines 28 and 29 of the German reference say: "Bei der Herstellung des Schlüssels wird zunächst die Kappe (3) in den Griff (2) eingesetzt."

In English: „During production of the key initially the cap (3) is inserted into the handle (2)“.

The cap (3) is initially inserted prior to the shaft 1 of the German reference. Thus the cap does not serve as a stop. The arms 7 of the German reference are in fact deformed to assume a position in the area of the cap 3.

The German reference teaches that the purpose of the cap 3 is shock-damping (German reference, column 2, lines 12 and 13).

Furthermore the head of the German reference is not removable, since the arm 7 of the German reference are deformed during assembly.

The Office Action continues:

Terada teaches a end 13 of a key shaft which is within a key head 15 as having a thickness smaller than the rest of the key shaft. It would have been obvious to provide the end 8 of the key shaft of the German reference (691) as having a smaller thickness

than the remainder of the key shaft, in view of the teaching of Terada, the motivation being to allow less material to be used, as a cost savings measure.

Applicant respectfully disagrees. The German reference teaches to make the shaft from steel. In view of the severe processing methods of steel, a person of ordinary skill in the art would clearly have avoided the additional costs and complications of making the shaft with two different thicknesses contrary to the allegation of the Office Action.

The Office Action continues:

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gartner (965) in view of Humphrey (346) and Terada (665).

Applicants respectfully traverse. Whereas Gartner and Terada refer to a key, Humphrey refers to a key holder for a specific key 29, where the key 29 is particularly adapted to the key holder of the Humphrey reference.

The Office Action continues:

Gartner teaches an end 60 of a key shaft inserted into a slot 36 of a key head, and a stop 68 for engaging an aperture 61 of the key shaft.

According to the reference Gartner, column 4, line 53, the elements 68 are tongue portions. According to Fig. 4 the tongue portions 68 appear to lock the shank in a position, but the tongue portions 68 are not a stop.

The Office Action continues:

Humphrey teaches an end of a key shaft having projections and a semi-circular area to receive a stop 21, 28 inserted into a perforation 16.

The stop (6) of the present application is holding shaft (10) and head (1) of the present invention together. Humphrey designates element (21) to be a bar and element (28) to be a tube and not to be a stop. Humphrey shows in Fig. 1 that a threaded projecting portion (25) goes through the hole (16), but not bar (21) and tube (28).

Applicants conclude that the reference Humphrey does not teach the feature “which head is provided with a body (2) which, in the central area, has a perforation (4) in which a stop (6) is introduced, retaining the shaft (10) together with the head.” As recited in claim 1 of this application.

The Office Action continues:

Terada teaches a reduced thickness 13 of an end of a key shaft, as set forth above.

Terada is making a key, where a synthetic resin covers an insertion portion. However, no detachable head of a key is taught in the reference Terada.

The Office Action continues:

It would have been obvious to substitute projections and a semicircular area for the end of the key shaft 60 of Gartner for receiving a stop through a perforation of

the key head, in view of the teaching of Humphrey, the motivation being to allow the key shaft of Gartner to be easily removable when desired, as seen in fig. 7 of Humphrey.

As stated above the bar (21) and the tube (28) of Humphrey , the alleged stop of the Office action are clearly not inserted into the hole (16) of the Humphrey reference.

The Office Action continues:

It would have been obvious to provide the end of the key shaft of Gartner with a smaller thickness than the rest of the key shaft, in view of the teaching of Terada, the motivation being to allow less material to be used, as a cost savings measure.

Making the shaft of Gartner thinner as proposed in the Office Action would clearly interfere with the locking function of element (68) as seen in Fig. 4 of the Gartner reference. It is respectfully urged that a person of ordinary skill in the art has no suggestion or direction from within the four corners of the references to do what the Office Action proposes.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The art recited represents the state of the art at the respective time of publication, but does neither anticipate nor render obvious the present invention.

Reconsideration of all outstanding rejections is respectfully requested.

All claims as presently submitted are deemed to be in form for allowance and an early notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Antonio Frias Frias

By: Horst M Kasper

Horst M. Kasper, his attorney,
13 Forest Drive, Warren, N.J. 07059
Tel.:(908)526-1717 Fax:(908)526-6977
Reg. No. 28,559; Docket No.: CON205

rep/sn/am